<u>Remarks</u>

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 25, 29, 33, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178241 of *Eriksson* ("*Eriksson*").

Claims 22-24, 26, 34-36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Eriksson*.

Claims 27-28, 30-32, 39, and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Eriksson* and U.S. Patent No. 6,591,367 of *Kobata et al.* ("*Kobata*").

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 21 is not anticipated by *Eriksson* because *Eriksson* does not disclose providing configuration data to a device in a server response to an HTTP request from the device as claimed in amended claim 21. *Eriksson* discloses a server 106 that sends configuration parameters to a device 102 (*Eriksson*, paragraph 40) but does not teach that the configuration parameters are sent to the device 102 in a server response to an HTTP request from the device 102 as claimed in amended claim 21. In further contrast, the server 106 of *Eriksson* initiates a configuration operation by sending a request to the device 102 to obtain a description of the device 102 (*Eriksson*, col. 7, paragraphs 27 and 40) whereas a device according to amended claim 21 initiates a configuration operation by sending an HTTP request to a configuration server.

Given that claims 22-32 depend from amended claim 21, it is submitted that claims 22-32 are not anticipated by *Eriksson*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 33 is not anticipated by *Eriksson*. Amended claim 33 is a method for configuring a device that includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 21. Therefore, the

- 6 -

remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 21 and *Eriksson* also apply to amended claim 33.

Given that claims 34-42 depend from amended claim 33, it is submitted that claims 34-42 are not anticipated by *Eriksson*.

Applicant also submits that claims 22-24, 26, 34-36, and 38 are not obvious in view of *Eriksson* because claims 22-24, 26, 34-36, and 38 depend from amended claims 21 and 33 and because *Eriksson* does not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in a server response to an HTTP request from the device as claimed in amended claims 21 and 33.

Applicant further submits that claims 27-28, 30-32, 39, and 41-42 are not obvious in view of *Eriksson* and *Kobata* because claims 27-28, 30-32, 39, and 41-42 depend from amended claims 21 and 33 and because *Eriksson* and *Kobata* doo not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in a server response to an HTTP request from the device as claimed in amended claims 21 and 33. Applicant has shown that *Eriksson* does not disclose or suggest providing configuration data to a device in a server response to an HTTP request as claimed in amended claims 21 and 33. *Kobata* discloses a system for protecting messages from unauthorized access (*Kobata*, col. 2, lines 18-22) rather than providing configuration data to a device in a server response to an HTTP request from the deviceas claimed in amended claims 21 and 33.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11-10-05   By: _____

Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No.: 36,167

- 8 -

Attorney Docket No.: 10003415-1